

The Committee of Inquiry met at 10:30 a.m., June 30, 1965 in Dean Burns office for the purpose of receiving his recollections of the events surrounding the selection of President Elliott against the recommendations of the Faculty. Professor Wood and Professor J. F. Davison were present. Professor Wolfgang Kraus was absent.

There was a short discussion preceding this interview regarding the relative merits of the Committee completing its report before President Elliott's arrival or waiting for him to come down and getting his thoughts in the matter of Faculty-Trustee relationships. Dean Burns seemed to feel the Committee should not meet with Dr. Elliott, while the members of the Committee felt they should.

\* \* \* \* \*

Q. The point which the committee is most interested in is what made you go to Dean Linton's office. What motivated you?

A. Shortly before that at an Educational Policy Committee meeting - a week before - the President read a telegram which had been sent to Mr. Ellison by Mr. Ransom to the effect that he was no longer to be considered - he was buying out. The President said it was too bad, but he was perfectly willing to continue as Acting President until someone else could be found. This suggested to Dean Burns, and others got the same impression, that the Trustees were not going to do anything. The status quo would continue. This disturbed Dean Burns and some of his colleagues and a day or two or three later, when word got around - Cal Linton talked to some people and then he told Dean Burns that the departmental chairmen asked him to call <sup>a meeting</sup> on ~~on~~ May 7 - and meanwhile Dean Burns was called by Charlie Cole saying that the chairmen were having a meeting, and many thought that the deans ought to meet to impress the Trustees with the need to resolve the whole situation. Cal read a letter - a draft of a letter he would read to the group - and Dean Burns thought it was too long and too argumentative so he drafted a letter which was to go to the Trustees to make their thinking known. Dean Burns called Dean Linton a half hour before the meeting. He said (Dean Linton), "This is good. I won't even bring mine." They went to the meeting. Tom Brown read off his discussion and there was talking. He read a letter from Courtland Perkins (which was sent to Arthur Miller, Secretary of the Committee.) About a quarter to one, Cal called on Dean Burns. (He, (Linton), had been designated Chairman of the meeting) Dean Burns said we should communicate with the Trustees and they approved it (the letter) and it was sent to the Trustees.

Q. Did this endorse rather heavily the appointment of John A. Brown?

A. Two things: 1) we needed an early resolution of the matter. Preservation of the status quo would be damaging, and 2) we think John A. Brown is qualified and urge his appointment as Vice (sic) President.

Q. Had you known about the feelings of the Trustees on John A. Brown?

A. About two months before, Mr. Ellison had a luncheon meeting and invited five deans to it. Hamblin, Mason, Linton, Nutting and Burns. At that meeting, he stated in effect that he did not regard John A. Brown favorably for the presidency of the University and he gave at least one reason. He said he had mounted a campaign in his own behalf and this involved pressure on the trustees and especially Ellison and he did not like anyone who organized a campaign in his own behalf. (This meeting occurred some time in February or March.)

Dean Burns recounted an incident which occurred when Brown and Dean Burns had lunch at the American Council of Education. Clarke Kerr spoke at this luncheon. We were sitting with Brown at the end of the table when Gladfelter came up and greeted Brown. It was the first time Dean Burns had met Mr. Gladfelter and the first time Brown had done so and Mr. Gladfelter asked Mr. Brown about what was going on at the University.

Brown said the Faculty had elected a Committee and there was also a Trustees Committee. Gladfelter said why are they looking around? "They ought to appoint you. I am going to write to mutual friends and write to the Trustees in your behalf." This was completely spontaneous and could not be considered a campaign. Ellison said maybe he had misjudged the man.

Q. Did Ellison say he had made a mistake about J. A. Brown?

A. I do not know whether he ever made this admission. He just said maybe he had misjudged the man.

Q. Since it is known about the hostility to John A. Brown, it was thought that the Communication of the Deans and Chairmen would help him rather than hinder him?

A. Perhaps they did. When I met with Ellison on May 11 and presented this letter to him I told him that this meeting was called and the letter written without the knowledge of John A. Brown. He had nothing to do with the meeting.

Q. Did Mr. Ellison have advance information that this meeting had been called?

A. He had no advance information, Dean Burns thought, because he was out of town. The letter was written on Friday and it was still in Dean Linton's office for additional signatures on Monday. Dean Burns called Ellison on Monday but he was out of town. They wanted to present the letter to him before it went to the Trustees. His secretary said he was in New York. She had set up a tentative meeting on Tuesday. Later she called back and said it would not be convenient. So they set the meeting up for four o'clock. Later that day, shortly after lunch, Colclough got in touch with Dean Burns. He had heard about the letter apparently over the weekend.

Q. We have heard he knew about it on Friday?

A. There was an ODK meeting on Friday night and this may have been discussed. Dean Burns was not there. Stan Tracy heard about the letter at that meeting and told Dean Burns later. Tracy said he told Newell Ellison about this letter on Saturday. It was Monday that Colclough called about the letter. "What is the point of this?" Dean Burns told him the meeting was called on Friday and he thought it would be advisable to have something prepared for the meeting and that he had drafted this letter and Colclough obviously did not like this and wanted confidential information because Ellison was going to call him that day.

Q. One of the members of the Faculty Committee called Mr. Ellison Friday evening and Mr. Ellison had told Hughes to interview Elliott that day. This is remarkable, is it not?

A. Yes, because when we talked to Ellison at 4 o'clock, Tuesday, May 11, he said at that time there are two people who are in effect final candidates for the job - one is Ransom and one is Brown. There might be another one, Elliott, who is being interviewed by Hughes in New York.

Q. Dean Burns was then told about a report that one of the deans had left the Dean's Meeting and gone to see Colclough.

A. I did not know about that.

Q. Why did you decide to address your communication to the Board rather than to the Faculty Committee?

A. The reason generally was that it was not Dean Burns' decision but a group decision.

If it went to the Faculty Committee, it would then go to the Trustees Committee and probably not go from there to the Trustees. So it was addressed to the Trustees. They presented the letter to Ellison as a matter of courtesy and he said he was impressed. He volunteered to send it. Dean Burns said yes because they thought it would be better coming from him. He called the next day and said the letter had been rephrased and was being sent out but he was not sending the letter showing the three people who had resigned from the Committee.

Q. Looking at it objectively, was there any possible relationship between the letter of the three faculty members and the Friday meeting of the deans?

A. The letter was brought by Tom Brown to the meeting we had with Ellison. Cole, Linton, Brown and I met with Ellison. We had the letter signed by the Faculty. We presented the case to Ellison. Linton read the letter slowly to Ellison and then went down the list and called off the names of those who signed it and read over forty names, some of which were badly written. Linton then gave Ellison a copy of the letter from the three people. Ellison had a copy of it. He may have gotten it earlier.

(There is a statement here about Tom Brown's acting as Chairman of the Department of Medicine rather than as a member of the Faculty Committee.)

Q. Did Ellison lead you to believe that there was a good chance that Brown would be the final candidate because he did not believe Ransom was serious?

A. Ellison said Ransom was still interested. He said Ransom, Brown and Elliott, who was being interviewed that day in New York, were the candidates.

Q. We have heard someone called Ransom from Airlie House and the call was to the effect  
that the Faculty was strongly behind Brown and Ransom should know this - and if the  
Faculty were strongly behind Mr. Brown, Mr. Ransom said he did not wish to be considered?

There is a question of Brown's being connected with Airlie House?

A. This has something to do with David C. Green. The man who made the call is a former Episcopalian Rector who is intimate with Green. Green is a ~~lay professor~~ and he ~~had business~~ <sup>with Leuson</sup> ~~in~~ Ransom. His belief is that Ransom was out because of leakages of information. Apparently there was a call from Airlie House by the Assistant Executive officer. <sup>Airlie House helped</sup> Green thought it was inappropriate to try to recruit someone over Jack Brown. Apparently, Ransom got into so much trouble because of leakages. The impression Green got was that if we had pressured him more aggressively, he would have taken the job.

Q. Have any of the deans had a chance to talk with Elliott?

A. I talked with him about a week before their meeting (approximately the 27th of May). This was the meeting of the Deans plus Herzog. Just talked for an hour.

Q. Did you write a letter giving your impression of Elliott? How did you expect this to be used.

A. I did not think about how it would be used at all. The President said he would like a very quick response - that day - I had it about a half hour after the meeting. He may have received my evaluation that day. My letter said that he was an agreeable, clean-cut looking type, quiet (possibly inconsequential), but that his background training and work experience was not what we wanted at the University. Frankly, he is not the man for the job. What use was made of the letter I do not know. Some say they were read to the Trustees.

Q. Do any of the Deans feel that their jobs as deans have been seriously embarrassed by these activities. In case we meet Elliott, we would like to know whether he has?  
~~read those Deans letters~~

A. I never heard anything like that. It has never been a personal matter. It is just a question of the best man for the job.

Q. Do you think J. A. Brown could work with Elliott? At least for a year or so until everything clears up?

A. He seemed an affable, agreeable, friendly type. Quite possibly, John A. Brown could work with him. It is hard to judge from a meeting of that type because he is under pressure. Obviously, he would be agreeable in a situation like that.

Q. Do you think he knows about the tension in this University that he would have to face?

A. He did not give me that impression, because there are obvious facts he clearly did not know about the University. He said he walked around, saw the place, but did not go in.

Q. Would it be desirable for him to see "Basic Considerations, etc." (Dean's Report)? We have been trying to get him to see this.

A. Well, I think Elliott ought to see that report.

Q. Do you know why it has not been distributed?

A. My personal belief is that the Acting President regards the report as a "negative and critical" report and as a consequence, he was angered by the deans for the report. In fact, it could be construed by him as criticism of his administration and his role in the University because it was negative, critical and possibly critical of him.

Q. Do you know what the Vice President and Treasurer thinks of it?

A. I don't know.

Q. Would it be generally to his thinking?

A. I do not think so.

Q. Would you be surprised to hear that the Board of Trustees had seen a copy?

A. It went to one of the Committees.

(Professor Davison mentioned it was given to Carmichael but not distributed by him) One member of the Board feels it was very constructive. He had seen it, He is a high official in government. He thinks it is fine. We asked Morris and Phillips about whether they had seen it. They said they wanted to see it.

Mr. Burns asked if the Trustees had received it yet and was told that the committee did not know.

Mr. Davison said that the University Objectives Committee had it, but we could not get it until the Committee finishes its report. There may be other difficulties.

Q. Should President Elliott see the report before he comes down here?

A. Yes, I think so.

Q. Did you ever think that the organizational set up between the Faculty Committee and the Trustees Committee was not good?

A. One of the Interim Reports of Tom Brown's suggests this, - but not from any member of the Faculty Committee.

a  
Q. How can/better communications system be set up between the two committees?

A. I really don't know. The degree of communication between committees depends on the willingness of both parties to communicate freely. People have to want to communicate.

Q. Professor Wood said he had gathered the impression that the Board is a fairly tightly run organization but it appears to him that there was a different desire on the part of the Chairman not to have completely free communication.

A. I have heard he felt this way.

Q. There was complete opportunity to communicate freely to the Chairman of the Board and they did communicate. But it made no impression on the final decision. It was announced so suddenly that some people feel they have been betrayed. Why did they make so little impression on the Board?

A. I have no idea.

Q. There were such opportunities to communicate. They seemed to have communicated their disapproval of J. Perkins and their approval of Courtland Perkins. Some people feel they have been deceived. Do you feel you have been misled?

A. When we talked with Elliott on May 11, he said Brown would be one of two, possibly three, up for final consideration and he said his impression of Brown was improving. He was growing in stature. Generally, he indicated a more favorable impression of Brown. He did not say so, but we asked if he would go before the Trustees as a candidate. He said it might but he could not speak for the Board. We left thinking Mr. J. A. Brown had a fairly good chance of being President.

Q. You discussed this with Mr. Morris also?

A. Mr. Morris is a pleasant, agreeable man, and at our meeting he talked about the letter. We were filling him in about the letter. It was in the early part of that week that we met with Morris and he said he liked J. A. Brown, thought him a nice person, he was very fond of Mrs. Brown. He said the wife of a President was very important and Mrs. Brown is a real asset to Mr. Brown and he thought he would make a good President.

Q. Why did you see Morris?

A. We saw Ellison, then we saw the Vice Chairman, Mr. McKelway, and we made him "the third man to see."

Q. Were you aware that Morris and Phillips were meeting with the Faculty Committee at that time?

A. Yes, I heard that Mr. Morris was present with them when they met with the Faculty Committee.

Q. We have not been able to find any break in the solidarity of the Trustees. We do not feel that there was unanimous heartfelt support but they certainly give that impression. Do you know any Trustees who might have a more sympathetic view of the Faculty situation?

A. I do not know many of the Trustees. Jim Van Story seemed to be sympathetic. I saw him the night before the Trustees meeting and it was clear he was favorably disposed toward Jack Brown.

Q. Do you think the Trustees did not have any vote until after Tom Brown appeared to make his statement. There was such strong feeling. There seemed to be a unanimous vote of the Board. There was such strong support of Elliott?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you know anyone who was asked to accept the presidency during the last two weeks?

A. I have not been told by anyone who was approached. I did hear that Ellison was reported to have talked to people.

Q. Did you hear to whom?

A. Yes, Allan Carter.

Q. Would you be surprised to hear that as late as June 2, it was necessary to send around a dossier of Elliott to members of the Board?

A. I heard this.

Q. How would you interpret such a communication to members of the Board?

A. I would interpret it as tantamount to a recommendation of Elliott.

(It was probably carefully drafted, such a communication to members of the Board from xxxxxx the Chairman of the Board, could be interpreted  
(The secretary does not know whose statement this was.)  
as a recommendation in favor of Elliott)

Q. Those who received it were not members of the inside group. Is this reprehensible or is it normal?

A. No reply recorded.

Q. Professor Wood said that the Faculty Advisory Committee were themselves rather impressed with Elliott. They went to Maine?

A. That is right.

Q. The Secretary did not hear this question.

A. There was not at the beginning. I heard some of the Faculty Committee people were quite favorably impressed with Elliott. Not unanimous, but quite impressed.

(There was some discussion of Cosmos Club meeting with Ellison and why if they were unfavorably impressed with Elliott, it was not brought out at the June 7 meeting of the Assembly.)

Q. The Secretary did not hear this question.

A. Just the comments he made.

(There was a statement about "Tom Brown's having received applause at the end of his statement. Morris did not recall it and their (the two Trustees) thinking that probably it came when Mr. Brown said the Faculty would abide by the decision of the Board, etc.)

A. Dean Burns said he did not know about that.

Q. Did they have other evidence of objections on the part of the Faculty to Elliott?

A. Thirteen deans signed the memorandum that of the three people reported to be under active consideration - Brown, Elliott and Cole - Brown's qualifications were superior.

Q. Professor Davison said they had met with Elliott on the 28th of May. There was a question of his lack of education and fundamental qualifications and you thought you should communicate your point of view?

A. This was written at the meeting on the fourth or fifth. The memorandum was dated at the time of the meeting.

Q. It was not delivered until June 1?

A. The meeting of the Deans with Elliott was the 28th of May, then over the weekend some of us were talking and the meeting was called. I believe that Monday, the 31st or June 1st would be the date.

Q. The Faculty and the deans fully communicated their impressions to the Board and their opinions were so lightly valued or so little understood, that the Board did not give the Faculty the benefit of their own information. They should have prepared the Faculty Committee for it. Would this have helped any?

A. It might have. They were aware of the persons who signed the letter and the memorandum. If they had postponed action for a week or two and made clear the reasons why they were in favor of Elliott, it might have had an impact but as it was, it was just brushing aside faculty opinion and taking action.

Q. Mr. Morris and Mr. Phillips were very surprised at the Faculty reactions.

A. They are insensitive men then.

Q. If the Trustees were sold on Elliott and came to a decision, why was no effort made to persuade them as the Trustees would not meet again until October?

Professor Davison said that Stevens needed him to get the Admiral out and Brown in. Mr. Ellison complained of how many communications had come to the Trustees from all people. He was appalled at all the communications he received on J. A. Brown, and he suggested they should have gone through the Faculty Committee. There is a question that your committee undercut the Faculty Committee. This trustee said he was antagonized by all this pressure.

A. At the meeting with Mr. Ellison in February or March. At that meeting which he called, he mentioned the manner in which J. A. Brown was named Dean of Faculties and he expressed resentment at the way in which it was done. It was brought out to him that it was, after all, President Carroll's decision, and just because he was irritated at President Carroll's method of doing this, was no reason to carry over to Brown.

Mr. McKelway also mentioned this when three or four of us met with him. He talked about the irregular character of the appointment and his irritation with it, but it should not carry over to J. A. Brown.

Q. A great disservice was done to J. A. Brown by his friends. You would not know about unauthorized approaches.

A. I know of one person who said he wrote directly to the Board. When I wrote to him, I wrote to the Faculty Committee.

Q. Morris said he did not have absolute power.

A. Evidently he did though because the action was taken.

Q. We have heard that the two persons who attended the Board meeting made very sincere and detailed reports except that Professor Schmidt's account was a little lengthy.

A. ~~XXXXXX~~ I had a phone call after the Board meeting from one of the members of the Board and he said the presentation of Tom Brown was excellent. The presentation by the second member was so rambling and gossipy and related to hearsay that it had the opposite effect. It made the people somewhat more sympathetic to Elliott than they were before. This man was strongly in favor of Brown. Jackie Coghran was ready to vote for Brown but she did not.

(Professor Davison talked briefly about lack of rapport between the Faculty Committee and the Trustees Committee.)

Q. Have you any suggestions that might improve this? Perhaps one committee comprised of Faculty and Trustees?

A. Something needs to be improved to have any effect at all. Perhaps a joint committee. It might work.

Q. Should the Faculty Code be revised to say that a President should not be chosen against the feelings of the Faculty.

A. Some might be irritated enough to approve it.

Q. Should we have the University Charter require alumni members and faculty members on the Board of Trustees?

A. I don't know of any universities who have this arrangement. I never heard of this.

Comment: About ten universities have such a thing.

Q. Do you think it would be well to have the Code amended that a President should only remain as long as he has the confidence of the Faculty?

A. How do you mean it would be manifest? (The Secretary is not sure this is the correct answer to this question)

(Davison then said that the committee had recommended that Dr. Elliott be induced to come down here as soon as possible, have J. A. Brown and Elliott work out their differences. This has been approved by the Board.)

Dean Burns commented that we would just have to wait and see.

Q. Do you think it would be possible to get J. A. Brown to stay at the University.

A. Dean Burns thinks Mr. Brown would stay if his conference with Elliott suggests he can work with Elliott and if Elliott is willing to give him a reasonably free hand in the academic program of the University. I think he would have to feel that there is a probability that much of the program would be put into effect.

Professor Wood said if this should work out, there would be an inborn type of rivalry and try as he might (he was waiting to pick up the pieces).

(There was some talk for a moment about Mr. Brown's self-control being remarkable.)

Dean Burns said he would regard any recommendation by this committee with the intention of Brown's appointment as Provost as a very difficult thing.

Dean Burns said it seemed to him that President Elliott will need all the help and experience possible to do his job effectively. Brown has this experience. It would be to Elliott's advantage to have Brown stay. That is, if they can be congenial. There is no personal animosity because they don't know each other.

Dean Burns said he had not heard anyone say that the position the deans took should harm them in the eyes of President Elliott. After all, the letter that went to the Trustees was signed before Elliott was a serious candidate.

(There was a short general discussion which was not to be a part of this record.)

The Committee of Inquiry met on 20 July 1965 for the purpose of hearing President-Elect Elliott's recollections of the events leading to his election as President of the University contrary to the recommendations of the Faculty. Professors Wood, Kraus and Davison were present.

- Q. Mr. Wood, Chairman, said that he had understood Dr. Elliott to say that he would like to have an opportunity to speak to the Faculty's committee?
- A. Dr. Elliott said he had wanted to, as he believed there might be some missing links in the chain of events.
- Q. Were you aware of the Faculty Committee's reports when you accepted this position?
- A. Dr. Elliott was not aware of them.

He thought it might help to put this in the proper perspective for him to reconstruct the events of the day or the events of that week. The day the Board acted to elect him was Saturday, June 5, 1965. Leading up to that date - it was in the early part of the week, Monday or Tuesday - (Dr. Elliott was not entirely sure) - the Chairman of the Board called him and stated that the Selection Committee of the Board was favorably inclined toward him, that he had talked with the Advisory Committee of the Faculty, with whom Dr. Elliott had met, and that - Dr. Elliott thought he was quoting Mr. Ellison verbatim - "They have given you a clean bill of health in their preliminary report, but they have asked for the privilege of investigating your work at Maine further before giving the final report." In the early part of the week, Monday or Tuesday, before June 5 - Dr. Elliott said he was still quoting Mr. Ellison - Mr. Ellison said, "I don't know how a faculty does this sort of thing. Perhaps you do." Dr. Elliott said he did know. A faculty committee charged with this responsibility will pursue things in different ways. Some interview various people in the (academic) community by telephone and ask for some evaluation of their counterparts at the other institution. It is not unlikely that senior Professors at The George Washington University would talk to senior Professors at Maine. Mr. Ellison said he expected to have another meeting with the Committee the latter part of the week and he would keep Dr. Elliott informed. This was Commencement Week and Alumni Reunion weekend at the University of Maine. In fact, their Commencement was held on Wednesday and Thursday, the Alumni met, culminating with the Alumni Dinner on Saturday evening. "As everyone knows," Dr. Elliott said, "This was a hectic period for some of us and I was immersed in their activities." It was on Friday afternoon - the latter part of it - that Mr. Ellison called Dr. Elliott and said that the Faculty Committee had raised the question about one of his appointments at the University of Maine. "You have appointed a dean who is apparently not satisfactory to a group of the Faculty and you have continued to support him despite this opposition." and his question was that he would like to have an explanation of Dr. Elliott's action in this case as he saw it - not for himself - but so he could report it to the Selection Committee of the Board of Trustees and Dr. Elliott gave him his answer to this situation. Dr. Elliott did not know whether this present Committee wanted his answer or not?

(Here, after short discussion, it was decided that this Committee was not to re-evaluate any decisions of Dr. Elliott's on any such matters.)

Dr. Elliott then resumed. He stated that Mr. Ellison said he and other Trustees were meeting again before the Board Meeting. This is the way he left it with him on Friday afternoon. Mr. Ellison said they were meeting again with the Faculty Committee and if there were any serious questions raised, Mr. Ellison would call him. He did not get any call from Mr. Ellison. Dr. Elliott was near the telephone all day and he did not get any call from him. He was available all morning, ~~in his~~

in his office most of the time, and in a conference room later where the University operator said she could locate him if a call came in. At no time during these discussions was any indication given to Dr. Elliott that the Faculty was in any way opposed to his nomination and not until the following week - on Monday - was he aware of any opposition to his appointment. In fact the first word he got was from a newspaper reporter who said, "You are undoubtedly aware of The George Washington University resolution taken at a faculty meeting. He read them to me over the phone." Not until after that Monday did Dr. Elliott - some days later in fact - see the copy or hear the report that the deans and chairmen of departments had signed a petition asking the Board of Trustees to elect Mr. Brown as President.

(There was a comment here by one of the committee members that "One does not go this far" - presumably referring to one of the reports of the Deans and Chairmen of Departments.)

About Tuesday, Dr. Elliott received a clipping from the Washington Post dated Saturday which described the meeting and which, of course, carried something of the tension prevalent on campus and of the different points of view held by the Trustees and Faculty. Monday, needless to say, when this action was taken, Dr. Elliott's telephone rang the rest of the day.\* Many calls were from newspaper people and still he was much in the dark about what was happening except for what reporters told him and he knew them (the reporters) well enough to know how to deal with them and what kinds of questions may be asked.

On Monday evening, Mr. Morris called to say he was the new Chairman of the Board of Trustees. Dr. Elliott had no evidence of a reorganization of the Board and that Mr. Ellison had stepped down as Board Chairman and had already left on a three-month trip. He said he need not add the sense of shock he felt at the turn of events on Monday.

(There was a comment here by one of the committee members to the effect that the Board of Trustees were also quite surprised.)

Q. We talked with members of the Board and they thought the Faculty had not been completely honest with them. They had "over-communicated", it was thought. Your experience is perhaps not remarkable then?

A. For the University of Maine, this (week) was the high point of the year. Dr. Elliot received the telephone call from Mr. Ellison at 5 pm on Saturday evening (approximately - late afternoon anyway) and he said you have been unanimously elected President. "May I go back to them and tell them of your acceptance?" Dr. Elliott said "Yes." His wife was on her way to the Alumni Dinner and Dr. Elliott was to speak at the end of the dinner. He was (thinking of) what kind of announcement to make. One of his staff heard on the radio that "Elliott has been made President of The George Washington University." Dr. Elliott got up at the end of the banquet and told them he had been elected, because he had not wanted them to read it in the paper or hear it on the radio. After all, Dr. Elliott said, he had been meeting with these people for several days, and working with them for seven years, and he did not want them to get the news in this way. Then on Monday everything seemed to be , when up to that point it had been a routine development. As Dr. Elliott had stated before, on Monday as soon as this news broke, he talked three times with a reporter from Time Magazine, one reporter from Newsweek, several times with reporters from the Washington papers and one from "Boston North", including every paper in Maine, plus radio and television and in late evening he got the call from Mr. Morris.

- Q. Two of the people involved in this episode are very ill and physically very tired, Dr. Colclough and Mr. Ellison, etc.?
- A. This is something that Dr. Elliott was completely unaware of at the time. He did not know of the burdens Mr. Ellison had carried for some time. Dr. Elliott and Mrs. Elliott found Mr. Ellison most gracious and hospitable to them when they came down and they did not know of the burdens he had carried over the year.
- Q. There were some remarks here about "candor in communications" and then "for reasons not entirely easy to express, the impression is conveyed to one after a while that he (Ellison) not only carried the burdens of the Chairman of the Board but actually was in the habit of being an "individual actor." He is a very determined man. He carried a disproportionate part of the burden. Relatively few of the Board members were aware of some of his decisions. Mr. Morris and Mr. Phillips were brought into the selection business very late?
- A. There are two things that "bubble up" in reconstructing this. One is the way the Chairman informed the rest of the Board of the matters that had a bearing on Dr. Elliott's appointment. The other is the extent to which he failed to inform Dr. Elliott of the expressions of Faculty opinion, even the late ones made, as well as the previous ones on record in written form. Dr. Elliott could only conclude on Saturday evening when this message reached him that he was unanimously elected, and that The George Washington University community was pleased with this. This is the only thing he could conclude, and that whatever the Faculty Committee had asked, it had been satisfactorily answered.

They did not say anything to indicate that the Faculty was not satisfied, only that they had brought up this one matter. "They have given you the green light," Mr. Ellison said.

\* \* \* \* \*

At this point, Dr. Kraus discussed the Faculty Assembly meeting and the following remarks were made:

<sup>A</sup> The Faculty Committee had acted in accordance with its best judgment. The Assembly had no other proper choice if it wanted to be honorable. The actions of the Board were not designed to modify or overcome the problems; as everyone knows, the legal authority of the Board in making appointments is acknowledged, but it is also true that when you have a Faculty Committee, it is abnormal to have its recommendations countered or superseded by the action of the Board, which it has not attempted to explain it.

\* \* \* \* \*

- Q. The Faculty was not as informed as the Trustee's Committee. We asked them why we had not been given all the information. There was a great lack of information and candor in communication. However, we cannot undo this. It has been done. We would like to work out some fruitful relations with you and the Board of Trustees?
- A. It is apparent to me that this is a matter of first order at this University.

Mr. Wood then stated some of the suggestions for better relations as described in the book "Government of a University," with regard to "collateral chains of command" including joint meetings of Trustees and Senate committees etc., and Dr. Elliott asked if this had ever been brought up to the Trustees as a suggestion.

(4)

Mr. Davison described an attempt to establish such a relationship with the Board about "40 years ago." Later, President Marvin had made it clear during his tenure that a "committee system" was not approved by him or by the Trustees. Mr. Kraus, speaking as ex-Chairman of the Senate, reviewed a recent meeting he had with some members of the Board. He said it was apparent in these conversations that Senate minutes never came into the hands of the Trustees and the Trustees were equally surprised to learn that the Faculty did not receive copies of the minutes of the Board meetings.

Q. Mr. Wood said he would like to amplify what Dr. Kraus said about the June 7th meeting. Two resolutions were presented. One was passed and the other rejected by about the same majority. The one passed was in support of the recommendation of the Committee elected by the Assembly. The other which was rejected was proposed to the effect that Dr. Elliott was unqualified. These two things make it clear that the action was not directed against any individual at all but rather to show the view of the faculty that its recommendations should be given serious consideration.

A. Dr. Elliott said he appreciated that, and in retrospect, from what he had read in the record and from discussions, it is highly likely that any other name, such as John Smith, or John Doe, would have been handled in the same manner.

(After agreeing that this was the case, there was some discussion of the reporter at the Faculty Assembly meeting who was later ejected, and the distortions in the press, the non-agreement of the news stories with the subsequent editorials, etc.)

Q. The system did not work properly. We are looking for the reasons why.

A. Dr. Elliott said he hesitated to say this, and yet he thought it was on everybody's mind, that no system will guarantee the avoidance of this sort of thing, unless everyone acts in good faith.

Q. It is difficult to act in good faith unless you talk each other's language. We know now that we did not understand each other's language. We hope we may learn to do so?

A. Dr. Elliott said he thought this was true. He said he had a "horrible example" - a personal example of his own. He had served as Director for a couple of small corporations and attended one of the meetings as a new Director, wondering what it was all about. At the second meeting he attended there were about twelve directors sitting around the table. A discussion came up to which one man expressed a very mild objection. One week later this man resigned as a member. The President was upset because they had a difference of point of view in one matter. To differ from the President or his recommendations is in some Trustee's mind almost "a break." As a Trustee he can no longer support the President. This is of course an extreme example. When we talk about speaking the same language, Dr. Elliott hoped he had demonstrated his willingness to discuss and debate different points of view . . . "I do not know what it is but it seems to me that the corporate mind is not able to have a difference of opinion and still retain respect."

Dr. Elliott said no organization or provision for procedure will work unless there is good faith and various steps can be taken and provision made whereby this kind of relationship can be developed. It means to a great extent educating the ~~the~~ non-academic person into the academic world.

(Here there was some discussion of "teach ins" etc. and Dr. Elliott commented that he thought there were more people now who say maybe there is something ~~more~~ more to what they (the teach-ins, presumably) are doing.

A.  
the  
Sm.

(5)

(Dr. Kraus then spoke about the "rude" articles which had appeared in the newspapers about the Faculty Assembly actions, etc. and the reactions of the community toward the Faculty as a result of them, and Dr. Elliott stated that inasmuch he had received copies of these editorials, he supposed some relationship would be assumed between them and the Board. He said he did not himself believe there was any direct connection.)

Q. We have tried to make clear that "rehashing" the past is not going to do anything for us. We hope you can work out adequate relationships with the administrators.

A. Mr. Elliott said this brings up the question of "confirming his objective to come down as soon as possible."

Q. Mr. Wood then spoke of the two other matters which the Committee is asked to look into, namely, the AAUP Salary Scale matter with the accompanying Trustee reaction and the matter of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics and the Trustee reactions to it.

A. Dr. Elliott said that he was not in a position to supply facts on these matters but he appreciated being brought up to date on them.

Mr. Elliott said he wanted to ask a question about the \$250,000 expenditure for football. Does it come out of the funds of the University, or do the alumni contribute scholarships, etc. Do you, for instance, have 100 alumni contributing \$1000 a year because they want football?

(A description of the Annual Giving at the University was briefly given to Dr. Elliott and the statement was made that this would perhaps come as a shock to him, and Dr. Elliott replied that he was shocked.)

Dr. Elliott told an anecdote about a conference in Maine called the Yankee Conference in which the University of Maine is the only member which does not give athletic scholarships. This was a situation he found when he went to Maine and is one which still exists. He said he had been approached by various people at the University who would like to change this policy. Some delegates came to see him and they realized that Maine could not raise \$300,000 for athletic scholarships. They had discussed it seriously and thought the University should have a first-rate team in one area. They thought it should be basketball, and they were ready to underwrite these scholarships, if the Board could be persuaded to adopt such a policy. In Dr. Elliott's opinion this would be unrealistic because other sports would then be relegated to second-rate scholarships. Dr. Elliott said he asked the spokesman for the group if he would like to go to the head of the football squad, or the track squad and explain to them how they justified basketball above other sports because Dr. Elliott would not like to have to explain such a conclusion to them himself. They did not go - - - and that was two years ago.

Dr. Elliott went on to say that he would not like to leave this committee with an impression that he had taken a position on these matters, as he is not familiar with all the background at this time, and he had nothing to offer that was pointedly relevant to this topic.

Q. Mr. Wood stated that he felt Dr. Elliott had given the Committee some very helpful information and that the Committee was grateful to him for coming.

The meeting adjourned at 3 pm, approximately.



THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

July 6, 1965

MEMORANDUM TO MEMBERS OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE:

I have been informed by the Acting President that President-elect Elliott is planning to visit the University July 19-21, inclusive, to begin to get acquainted in detail with the programs, policies, and problems facing The George Washington University. He has expressed the hope that during this period he might meet with a representative group of the faculty. It is my thought that the members of the Coordinating Committee are just that. Consequently, it is requested that you plan to meet informally with President-elect Elliott at 4:30 p.m. on Monday, July 19, in the Faculty Conference Room, fifth floor, University Library. Elected members of the Senate, who are not members of the Coordinating Committee, are invited to attend.

*Reuben E. Wood*

Reuben E. Wood  
Chairman, Executive Committee  
University Senate